UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Toward Organic Humanism - - *Curtis W. Reese*

Humanism Is Not Atheism - - *Archie J. Bahm*

Psychology and Humanism - *E. Burdette Backus*

A Philosophy of Sportsmanship - *Corliss Lamont*

Humanism and Character - - *Ernest Caldecott*

Hitching a Church to a Star - - *Harold P. Marley*

VOLUME CXIX NUMBER 4

Chicago, April 19, 1937

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 67
Jottings—J. H. H. 69

ARTICLES—

Selected—EARL F. COOK 67
Toward Organic Humanism—CURTIS W. REESE 70
Humanism Is Not Atheism—ARCHIE J. BAHM 71
A Daring Dream—A. EUSTACE HAYDON 72
Psychology and Humanism—E. BURDETTE BACKUS 73
A Philosophy of Sportsmanship—CORLISS LAMONT 74
Humanism and Character—ERNEST CALDECOTT 75
Hitching a Church to a Star—HAROLD P. MARLEY 76
My Russian Impressions, VIII-IX—RABINDRANATH TAGORE (Translated by BASANTA KOOMAR ROY) 77

THE STUDY TABLE—

The Use and Abuse of History—J. L. ADAMS 80
Bayard Taylor—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 82
The Goal of Religion—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 82
A Review in Verse—H. K. T. 82

CORRESPONDENCE—

Tagore on Russia—FRANK S. HARWOOD 83
Commending Mr. Tigner—GEORGE L. MASON 83
Lucia Ames Mead the First to Propose Geneva as the World Capital—EDWIN D. MEAD 83
As to Bombing—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 83
The Spanish Crisis—WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE 83

THE FIELD—

The Friends and Gas Masks—*Nofrontier News Service* 66
"For All Religions, Castes and Creeds"—*Nofrontier News Service* 84
Ten Commandments for Industry—*Zion's Herald* 84

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Friends and Gas Masks

The enormous production of gas masks in Britain, coupled with intensive drives for anti-gas drills in schools, at special teas, and through special vans, has posed another serious problem for peace-minded people. The British Friends have supplied two answers to it which deserve to be studied.

As for anti-gas drills in the schools, the Friends' Guild of Teachers issued the following Memorandum:

> The Friends' Guild of Teachers . . . views with alarm the possible effect of such drill.
>
> It is inevitable that the ideas set up by such drill must cause great harm to children of nervous temperament by bringing possible horrors forcibly before them at a highly impressionable age. . . The danger of gas warfare is admittedly real. Yet it is certain that anti-gas drill must deepen our mutual fear and distrust and so help to destroy the faith that war can be avoided.
>
> Without committing ourselves as to possible action in time of war, we feel obliged as educators to protest vigorously against any attempt to enforce anti-gas drill in time of peace on the child population as being psychologically bad for the children and in every way opposed to the growth of right relationships between the nations.

The Quarterly Meeting of the Lancashire and Cheshire Friends also had some significant things to say about gas masks. They declared:

> We wish to offer a loving warning to our fellow-citizens not to put their trust in the provision of gas-mask appliances as a means of safety, or as a method of permanently solving the unemployment problem.
>
> No appliance can give complete immunity from the reach of gas poisons. Some of the worst gases . . . penetrate all parts of the clothing.
>
> We should above all turn our fellow-citizens' minds to the more deadly effects of the spiritual poison gases of fear and hatred which destroy the life of God in the soul. . . Active goodwill towards all men, including those who are called our enemies, removes the fear which is the occasion for the manufacture and use of gas masks.

—*Nofrontier News Service.*

(*Continued on page* 84)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXIX MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1937 No. 4

MAN AND THE UNIVERSE

"We are keeping time with the dance of the stars; the same atoms rhythmically coursing my body are coursing to the same beat out among the planets. When the springtime comes, and 'April runs thin-clad over the emerald hills,' I feel the sap of life tingling on its way to the beauty of grass and leaf and flower, on its way to awaken and nourish the sleeping buds. That is part of the process and I feel it as Whitman felt it. I become more than clay. I am awakened as the bud is awakened. Nature, although she may strike me down, has blessed me with a sense of wonder and has made me a citizen not of today but of yesterday and tomorrow. She may curse me, yet she can cheer me. She may not care for me or my fellows, but we can wring from her a few pearls of beauty and joy."

—Earl F. Cook.

IN APRIL, 1917, WE WENT TO WAR

There has been abundant remembrance of this fact in recent weeks. And the remembrance has not been a proud or happy one. On the contrary, there has been a very general confession that we were fools, or worse, in 1917, and a very general resolve not to be such fools, or worse, again. It is amazing, when you come to think of it, the unanimity of opinion that our entrance into the Great War was a tragic and terrible mistake. Two short decades—and all that fine flame of Wilsonian idealism buried forever away into cold, dead ashes! As a matter of fact that idealism was never sound—it was spurious from the beginning. We did not send our troops abroad because a great cause was calling us. There was no great cause there to call. That fearful war was only a struggle between two imperialisms for world mastery, with not a vestige of concern for democracy, civilization, or peace. These things did not come out of the World War, as we well know, and for the very simple and now obvious reason that they were never in it. What took us into the fight, from the purest motives as taught us by our misguided President, was, first, propaganda—deliberately fomented lies spread abroad like a poisonous contagion by agencies of falsehood that knew their vicious end. This was the wickedness of Britain and of France! Then, secondly, was our own innocence, or better still unconscious greed, in investing our good money in an alien war which, when lost, we sought to save by our armed intervention. The two influences went along together, and in the end clicked like two cogs of a machine. It was a terrible experience—not to be repeated if we are wise. But already, these twenty years after, the same snares are being laid to our feet, and there are bodeful signs that they may catch us. As Europe draws on to the verge of war, the same old catch-words of "the war to end war" and "to save civilization against the barbarians" are besieging our ears, and the people, even the pacifists, are succumbing. And, in the same way, business and profits are being proffered us for munitions, supplies, and money. It's the same old game, played once again by the same old gamblers. Let us beware! And let us resolve—*Never again!* No more war!!

THE SIT-DOWN STRIKE

Nobody seems to deny that the sit-down strike is illegal. Nobody seems to deny that it is the sworn duty of government under the law to suppress the sit-down strike. Nobody seems to deny that, under such conditions as have prevailed in Flint and Detroit, to suppress the strike would have meant bloodshed, perhaps on an extensive scale, and bloodshed under such conditions is revolution. It is this suggestion of revolution, of something like a new era in the history of the struggle between capital and labor, which leads inevitably to a consideration of the deeper implications of this sudden and amazing social phenomenon of the "sit-down." It is from this point of view that we have seen nothing quite so searching, so fair-minded, as a recent article in the New York *Times* by William Allen White, famous editor and author, old-time progressive, and in the last campaign a supporter of Mr. Landon. Mr. White declares that what we seem to have here is "a symptom of a new mental attitude of the American industrial worker." This worker is convinced, says Mr. White, that, whether his strike is legal or illegal, he is acting within his rights in taking over industrial property. What are these rights? "Fundamentally, the invaders are striking for the right to work. They are trying to clothe that right with a legal status. Instinctively they feel that their right to a job is a property right." Putting it another way—"under the common conception of property rights, the tools of industry belong exclusively to the owner. . . . Now the worker says in effect that all property rights in industry are affected by their public use." Industry has become a public utility! Which means that, in the factory as in the railroad, the owner has rights strictly subject to public control! It is in this sense, says Mr.

White, "we may be approaching a new conception of the rights of property in industry. . . . Mere trespass and invasion may not be the only issues involved in this question presented by the sit-down strike. Labor feels that the issues go deeper." It looks, in other words, as though "time marches on," and brings with it new crises, new decisions, and another step of progress. If we go back a hundred years to the time when trade unions were illegal, the mere right to organize forbidden, we can see that labor has traveled far. Who can believe that we can now say, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther?"

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

The unfavorable action of New York, Connecticut, and Nebraska has probably sealed the fate of the Child Labor Amendment. This tragedy, for it *is* a tragedy, is being used effectively in opposition to those who would substitute for the President's proposal for the reform of the Supreme Court a constitutional amendment limiting the Court's power. We think this not unfair—if we were on the side of the President in this Supreme Court fight we would use just this argument! Yet do we think that its implications exaggerate the difficulty of changing the charter of our government. For, with a single exception, no other constitutional amendment has ever encountered such stubborn and successful hostility as this Child Labor provision. Even this one exception, the sixteenth, took only some forty odd months, less than four years, for its ratification by the states, and the other amendments have averaged a ratifying period of less than fifteen months each. Involved in the Child Labor Amendment are objections, or rather prejudices, of peculiar potency. It is not so much the wicked employers who are defeating this measure for the liberation of childhood—it is such pressure groups as the Roman Catholic Church. Also, the Amendment itself must bear its share of blame, as must many a law declared unconstitutional not because the Court is reactionary but because the law is loosely drawn (witness the original Frazier-Lemke bill!). Thus, the Amendment might have been written to apply only to gainful occupations, and to define carefully the powers of Congress in the matter, and even in terms of a lower age limit (though we think this would have been a pity!), and then we believe all opposition would have disappeared and the Amendment long since have been accepted. Even so, we think that the process of amending the Constitution should be made easier—we like Senator Norris' idea that an amendment adopted by the two-thirds vote of both houses of Congress should be at once submitted to the people for a referendum vote! Meanwhile, the idea that a properly drawn amendment readjusting the Supreme Court to the present exigencies of government would be indefinitely blocked, or defeated, we regard as preposterous. Such an amendment might well beat the speed record of Repeal.

THE DANGER AHEAD!

When men speak of danger to this country, they think instinctively either of Communism or Fascism. Of these two possible perils, we regard the latter as the more serious. We have already had Fascism in Huey Long's Louisiana; there are distinct signs of Fascism in the Roosevelt administration's quest and use of power! But, as a matter of fact, we find it difficult to regard either Communism or Fascism as a really serious menace to America. Both seem to us to be alien to the basic spirit of our people. The real peril to the country, as we see it, and as Mr. Walter Lippman has recently declared in an important article, lies elsewhere. It is in the probability, if not actual certainty, that the present Washington regime will be succeeded suddenly and decisively by a conservative reaction which will make the days of Harding and Coolidge look like enlightened progressiveness. Roosevelt seems secure with his great popular support and his huge majorities in Congress—but so did the Republicans in the boom days when men speculated as to whether the Democratic Party would ever elect another president. It didn't take long to change that situation, and put the Republican Party in the position of the dying invalid. That's the way history moves—in cycles. Americans are particularly prone to these sudden reversals of favor, especially since the War plunged us into chaos. In the natural course of events a swing back is almost inevitable, and in the present confusion it may well come like a bolt from the blue. Roosevelt is obviously worried—his Supreme Court proposal can be explained on no other basis! He must see, as any sensible man can see, that he can't go on much longer at the present pace and in the present direction. The unbalanced budget, the threatened inflation, the continued unemployment, the labor unrest and discontent—they all point to a crash, and then such an overturn of public favor as we have not seen since the people turned on Hoover. The tragedy of it all is that a President with deeply sincere human sympathies, nobly progressive ideals, and a genuine political genius, should have none of that soundness of judgment and stability of character which make the statesman. Unless something is done, and done speedily, the net result of all the New Deal will be the longest period of black reaction this nation has ever seen.

WHAT WILL MUSSOLINI DO?

Loyalist victories in Spain bring a two-fold thrill. First, there is the satisfaction that the people's cause, in a fight which must now apparently be fought through to the end, is winning. Secondly, there is the exultation that Mussolini's jaw is getting the kind of smash it so richly deserves. That brutish "mug" has been inviting a crack for a long time—and now it's getting it in grand, good style. But, comforting as such spectacles are, can we really rejoice in them in any true and worthy sense? Is the defeat of the Italian troops on Spanish soil going to get us anywhere aside from such

inner feelings as we may share with spectators at a prize-fight? This fighting in Spain is serious business —the more serious as it prolongs the dreadful agony of the Spanish people and brings ever nearer the menace of a final cataclysm of arms. For look at Mussolini! His troops, sent to Spain to capture Madrid and end the war, have been beaten. Italian colors have suffered the most humiliating defeat since Caparetto. Fascist soldiers, armed with the best weapons of our time, have fled ignominiously from the rudely equipped and hastily mustered peasants and workers of Spain. These Italians can make some kind of a show against Ethiopian spear-bearers, but not against Europeans! Will Mussolini stand for this? Not if we know the nature of this brutish demagogue. Reports that he is going to win the Spanish war forthwith, at whatever cost of troops and arms, sound all too credible. The Duce is in so deep, in other words, that he cannot now withdraw without utter disgrace, and thus must see it through. And this is the danger! For further action by Mussolini in Spain will constitute something like an open declaration of war not so much against Spain as against France and England and Europe generally. Will the democratic countries take this lying down? Not unless they themselves are prepared to suffer such ignominy and utter loss of prestige and power as no modern nations have ever endured. Hence the ironical fact that the victories of the Loyalists are bringing us nearer than ever to the dreaded next war! The European situation looks more hazardous to us today than at any time since the Spanish war began.

THE UNITARIANS FALL ON MISFORTUNE

The Unitarians seem headed for conflict at the forthcoming annual meetings in May. We had thought that our brethren were about to enter happily upon a period of reconciliation and reconstruction prepared for by the statesmanlike report of the Appraisal Commission. We had supposed that the new candidate for the presidency of the American Unitarian Association, Dr. Frederick M. Eliot, reared and educated in the East, active through years of devoted religious and public service in the West, an able, sincere and high-minded leader, was ideally fitted to the task of ending factionalism in the Unitarian body and thus uniting and inspiring it for a great creative work in this sorely troubled age. But alas, opposition has appeared in the person of Dr. Charles Joy, one of the most popular and well-beloved of all Unitarian clergymen. Out of this opposition are emerging all the old controversies on Beacon Hill, the insignificant but vexatious theist-humanist dispute which we thought had been profitably ended long since, and even such alien contentions as Roosevelt, the New Deal, and radicalism generally. It is our hope that something will happen or be done to prevent this threatened head-on collision. We dread the thought of contest between two such admirable men and their followers, not because we are opposed to contest in itself, but rather because we believe that this contest is unwholesome in the sense that it represents no real issues, but only prejudices and misunderstandings. Just for this reason the contest, if it comes off, will be bitter, and thus leave open wounds which will bleed the Unitarian body to weakness and despair. It is to be said for Dr. Eliot that he has not sought the A. U. A. presidency—he would have contentedly continued his career of parochial and public leadership in St. Paul. His response was to a call which moved him with a sense of duty and gave assurance of united sentiment in support not only of himself personally but also of the new day which he had come so ably to represent. And now comes the dissension which we believe Dr. Eliot would have made, and would still make, any sacrifice to avoid. But it is Dr. Joy who has consented to this issue, and who thus carries the responsibility for the outcome. Is it too late for reconsideration, and for that reconciliation which such reconsideration would surely dictate?

Jottings

Now, as we stamp our letters with "Jim" Farley's latest philatelic aberration, we have to do homage to three soldiers—Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan. We would like to see every user of these stamps inscribe across their face, *"We protest, in the name of peace."*

Mussolini is more of a Napoleon than we thought he was. At any rate, he is repeating triumphantly in Spain the experience Napoleon had there a century and a quarter ago.

The late John Drinkwater was one of two Englishmen—the other was Lord Charnwood—who did more to make Abraham Lincoln real to Americans than all American writers put together.

So far as we can make out, the public is divided over President Roosevelt's program for Supreme Court reform into two groups: those who support it because it is better than nothing, and those who oppose it because it is worse than nothing. Such sentiments combine to confirm Morris Ernst's conviction that the whole idea is one of "cringing desperation."

A German production of Schiller's *Don Carlos* is stirring great applause for the thrilling speeches on behalf of liberty. We shall probably soon hear that Schiller was a Jew, and that his play therefore must be withdrawn.

J. H. H.

Toward Organic Humanism

CURTIS W. REESE

Humanism travels steadily along a highway and is attacked from the right by able and hopeful theists, and from the left by able but despairing futilitarians. My own first attempt at developing a humanist philosophy of life, back in 1926, was reviewed from the right in *Zion's Herald* as too atheistic, and from the left in the *American Mercury* as not yet entirely free from the hocus-pocus of religion.

However, I am convinced that Humanism has but little to fear from either the right or the left, that its greatest danger is from within—as is the case with most movements. If Humanism fails to develop and clarify its basic attitudes and becomes a mere jumble of dissenting opinions; if it fails to become active in concrete human situations and merely observes social events from a detached position; if it fails to take seriously fundamental human needs—health and goods, romance and aesthetic experience—and becomes another parlor movement, then it will die and it will deserve to do so.

If, on the other hand, Humanism preserves its gains through the ages past and makes significant additions in the light of modern knowledge; if it masters the techniques of personal adjustments and actually plunges into the thick of the fight for a free and satisfying society, then it will live and it will deserve to do so.

Modern Humanism is the outcome of many traditions, chief among them the religious, the scientific, and the humanitarian. That it is the heir of the scientific and humanitarian traditions few would question. That it is the heir of the religious tradition many deny, but in my opinion their denial is without sufficient warrant.

Religion, despite its varying forms and expressions, is the committal of oneself to the finding and living of the kind of life that is inherently desirable, and so includes that which is fundamental in the humanitarian and scientific traditions, as well as that of religion.

I do not regard either the antiquity or the modernity of an idea, as such, an argument for or against its validity. There might even be some advantage in starting a movement *de novo,* provided of course one could find an idea that had no history. However this may be, Humanism has a history and must make the most of it.

Into the field of Greek thought some 500 years B. C. came a group of teachers who were called Sophists. Protagoras was perhaps the greatest of this group. He it was who gave us the text, "Man is the measure of all things." At that time there were two major philosophies: the materialistic and the theistic. Protagoras, who belonged to neither of these groups, applied Heraclitus' doctrine of flux to the human mind. He had his doubts about the existence of the gods, and, what is more, he said so quite frankly. Moreover, he taught the relativity of truth. Such heresy was not to be tolerated, so Protagoras was banished and perished at sea. This victory by force of the orthodoxy of the day over Protagoras was a serious blow to the free inquiry of free minds. When Protagoras' teachings are freed from the unfriendly setting in which Plato surrounded them, they sound familiar to modern Humanists. This ancient Sophist taught a rather thorough-going humanist view of things. He held that reality is to be altered for human ends; that knowledge is instrumental; that education is a real change of attitude, not the mere possession of facts; that language is for the control of facts and not to supply material for verbal acrobatics.

Not in direct line but comparable movements are early Buddhism and Confucianism. Also a fairly good case can be made for the Humanism of the early Christian movement. "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" is a text frequently used by Christian Humanists.

The Humanists of the Renaissance were a diverse group but, in the main, they agreed on making use of the Greek and Latin classics which attended more to the human situation and less to so-called divine matters than was the case with their contemporaries. Moreover, they restored the experimental method, secularized culture, and regarded knowledge as instrumental. While many of them made the typical modernist type of mistake, by putting new wine into old bottles, they nevertheless did much to restore human worth and dignity.

The enlightenment period from the middle of the seventeenth to the end of the eighteenth century might properly be called humanistic. This period was marked by renewed emphasis on science and human reason, in the effort to free the mind from dogmatism and authority, and to cast new light upon religious feelings and sentiments. It was a continuation of the spirit of both the Renaissance and the Reformation. The period of the enlightenment marked a complete break with theo-cultural arrangements.

The religion of humanity, led by Comte, while somewhat artificial in its doctrines and practices, was, nevertheless, thoroughly non-theological and belongs in the humanist tradition.

The philosophical Humanism of F. C. S. Schiller is regarded as an immediate forerunner of modern religious Humanism, despite the fact that Professor Schiller himself has abandoned his former use of the term as a name for a philosophy of life, and now limits it to a special theory of knowledge.

Also I should want to incorporate into the immediate background of Humanism the whole modern scientific and educational and critical movement in so far as it aims to discover, create, or control facts for human ends without regard to theological loyalties.

The movement popularly known as "Literary Humanism" belongs in the tradition, although it must be added, regretfully, that this movement does not flow out venturesomely into the main waters. This group rightly emphasizes proportion, balance, poise—the golden mean. It has a deep sense of history. It calls science, as well as other fields of knowledge, to the bar of the human spirit. But its chief difficulties are (1) a triple cosmology (natural, human, supernatural); (2) an old-fashioned natural science, which would all but exclude from its scope the social sciences; (3) an unduly rigid psychology, with too much "caution," not enough venturesomeness, too much regard for balance

and not enough regard for the relativity of centers of balance; (4) a pre-social sociology, individualistically centered and opposed to humanitarism and social enthusiasm; and (5) a supernaturalistic understanding of religion, which belongs to the age prior to the development of comparative religion. Although the literary Humanists are not as "near the kingdom" as one could wish, nevertheless, only a narrow Humanism would exclude them from their proper contribution to the organic whole.

Religious Humanism aims at an interpretation of religion in terms of an organic conception. While it in effect abandons the supernatural, it expands the natural. The old understanding of religion as the binding of man to a supernatural situation is changing, say the Humanists, to the understanding of religion as the committal of man to those causes and ideals that seem to him to have significance in his personal and social quest. Whatever may prove to be the cosmic situation, there are human gropings to be satisfied, there are human loves to be fostered, there are human friendships to be cultivated, there are physical and mental needs to be satisfied.

It was difficult to get very far with a satisfactory world view as long as the natural and the supernatural were constantly clashing. A natural situation was likely to be bombed at any moment by supernatural explosives. Whatever else religion may be, it is the natural functioning of a normal person in the effort to achieve a full, a free, and a socially useful life in ordinary circumstances. Like art, it may consciously plan its re-making; like philosophy, it may devote time to speculative interests; like government, it may try new social relationships. In and through these phases of life and many others, humanist religion will grow greater through the years.

As a philosophy Humanism is still in the making, and I trust that it will always be so. Its main framework, however, is this:

1. *The uniqueness of each person's outlook.*

A person's philosophy is the outgrowth of his nature and experience, the uniqueness of which cannot be removed from his philosophy. It is futile to seek a universally valid cosmic point of view. The Humanist is, then, at once ego-centric in that he looks out upon life through his own windows, and modest in that he is unwilling to read his own nature and experience into cosmic life as a whole. He regards philosophy as a useful instrument, but as basically personal and improvable.

2. *The evolving nature of life.*

The Humanist takes evolution seriously. He holds that life is still in the making, and that all are participants in the process. He refuses to sew up the universe in a neat little finished package or to put the finished end of life in the beginning of the process. To him creative evolution is a fact, not a mere figure of speech. The complement of the uniqueness of each person's philosophy is in the multiple and evolving nature of life itself where nothing is fixed and final.

3. *The intelligent control of materials, processes, and ideals for human ends.*

This is the crux of the matter. Humanism is not to be thought of merely as a method of solving the problem of knowledge, but as an attitude toward and a way of making life rich and full and glorious. It evaluates all materials, all processes, and all ideals in the light of their service to human ends.

The primary object of Humanism is to find out what human needs are, how they may best be met, and then to meet them. In doing this it will use every valid technique, whether ancient or modern.

The next needed step is further refinement of humanist thought in the direction of an organic conception of religion and life. This is a process that is going on in many fields, including the religious. Never was the time riper than now for the advance of a movement that sees life and religion as a whole, that is divisive only when division conditions wider relationships, that seeks the greatest possible human good on the widest possible scale, and that is oriented toward the future.

Humanism Is Not Atheism

ARCHIE J. BAHM

The question is often asked: Since Humanism* is an essentially non-theistic religion, why are not Humanists frank about it—why do they not call themselves atheists, instead of hiding behind the cloak of an ambiguous and pleasant-sounding term?

The answer demanded by such a question should make clear at the outset that the terms Humanism and atheism are not synonymous. For one may be an atheist and not be a Humanist, and one may be a Humanist and not be an atheist.

Atheism is usually regarded as a negative doctrine. Humanism is regarded, at least by its protagonists, as a positive doctrine. Atheism is the belief that God does not exist. Humanism is the belief that human values are the only values about which we can have reliable knowledge and that the furtherance of them is the chief aim of religious endeavor. Humanism is non-theistic, but it is not essentially atheistic.

If this distinction seems over-subtle or insignificant, consideration of the place of dogmatism in religion may make the distinction appear more important. Among the origins of the doctrine of Humanism, one is clearly epistemological. That is, the humanistic viewpoint in religion has grown out of, or at least been influenced by and strengthened by, investigations into the extent and limits of human knowledge. Since the time of John Locke the problem of knowledge has become increasingly important. And the prevailing solutions to the problem—be they realistic, idealistic, or pragmatic—are humanistic in the sense that they recognize that knowing is a process subject to the limi-

*The term "Humanism" as here used applies not to (1) the Renaissance revival of classical learning, (2) the Humanitarianism of Comte, (3) the epistemological movement more commonly known as Pragmatism, nor to (4) the literary doctrines of Babbitt, More and Foerster, but to (5) the religious movement recently developed in the United States under the leadership of several college professors and a number of "left-wing" Unitarian Ministers.

tations of human capacities. Philosophers are becoming increasingly skeptical of the extent of knowledge. Astronomers and physicists, with their telescopic and microscopic techniques, testify to the insignificance of our knowledge of a magnificent world. We know so litttle even of the nearest galaxies; how then can we know of a cosmic deity, a universal creator, an omnipotent guide? Or again, in spite of centuries of progress in psychology and epistemology, we know so little of the human mind; how then can we know of a mind of cosmic dimensions? Ventures about the unknown and unknowable are mere guesses. Humanists refuse to stress credence in speculations about the infinite and eternal. For such a gesture is a sign of human self-ignorance and, perhaps, of human conceit.

With such limited knowledge of the nature of the cosmos, one is forced to suspend judgment with regard to these ultimate matters. One who seeks to teach the truth should give an account of the world only as he knows it and has some reliable evidence for his interpretation of it. And one who demands thoroughly reliable evidence for his beliefs will not demand belief in the existence of God. Neither, on the other hand, will he demand the belief that God does not exist. For the final solution to the question of the existence of God involves evidence which is not within the reach of human knowing. Humanists, then, while not necessarily believing in the existence of God, do not, like atheists, necessarily believe that God does not exist. Humanism is a religion which concerns itself with human problems and human values, and is a religion which refuses to be dogmatic about problems unsolvable by human minds.

We do not wish to convey the impression that no Humanist denies the existence of God—as some persons conceive God. We have been speaking only of God in the most general sense—as infinite and eternal, and beyond the range of human ken. Humanists may well assert that God, as conceived by certain theists, does not and could not exist because the conception is internally inconsistent. The accepted tradition in logic is that human thought, in order to be true, must at least be self-consistent. Thus a Humanist would be on safe grounds in denying the existence of God so conceived. Such a denial would make him an atheist only in a very restricted sense. Furthermore, he might deny several such conceptions, and he would then be as many sorts of atheist as there were theisms that he denied. But neither one nor all of such denials would constitute his Humanism. For Humanism is not primarily a negative doctrine, but rather a positive doctrine. It is the belief that a man should quest for the good life in the best way that he knows how, and that since his knowledge is almost entirely knowledge of this earthly environment, he should seek the good life in it, here and now.

Again, we do not wish to convey the impression that no Humanist has claimed belief in the existence of God. For there are Humanists who claim to be theists also. But such "theists," as we shall see, are not genuine theists. Certain pragmatists are Humanists, yet, as pragmatists, hold that belief in God is a workable ideal, and that such a belief is, so far as it works, true. Such pragmatic theists are what might be called "make-believe" theists, rather than genuine theists. They "make-believe" that God exists, rather than actually believe that God exists. Such "make-believe" theism is not incompatible with Humanism so long as the "believer" recognizes that his "beliefs" are merely pragmatic in nature. But as soon as the belief in the existence of God is held dogmatically, the believer ceases to be a Humanist, for Humanists need not believe that God exists.

Thus far in this paper we have been concerned with showing how it is possible for one to be a Humanist without being a atheist. It is also possible for one to be an atheist without being a Humanist. This second thesis hardly needs argument, yet, for those who are slow to be persuaded, a brief word may serve to convince. All that is required of one who would be an atheist without being a Humanist is that he believe that God does not exist and either that there are no values or that there are some non-human values. An illustration of the first alternative is the extreme pessimist, who, after the manner of Schopenhauer, holds that there is neither God nor good in the world. Such an atheist could not be a Humanist because, to be a Humanist, one must believe that there is good in the world—human good. The second alternative may be illustrated by an atheistic idealism in which value is co-extensive with reality and in which there is some non-human reality. Whether any one holds such a position or not, it is clearly a possibility; and, like the first alternative, serves to differentiate atheism and Humanism.

In conclusion, then, if one may be a Humanist without being an atheist, and if one may be an atheist without being a Humanist, Humanists are clearly justified in objecting to the application of the term atheism to their religious beliefs.

A Daring Dream

"Today all over the world, religious leaders are rallying the peoples to try once more to realize the ancient ideal of a brotherhood of man on earth, to build, before the fall of the final doom, a glorious era of spiritual culture shared by all men.

"It may be a daring dream. World-weary philosophers of the ancient religions gave up the hope; world-denying saints sought the ideal in another world; sage theologians put their trust in God and despaired of the powers of man; practical men, laughing at the religious vision, deliberately mould the world to their will. The time has come to actualize the religious ideal by the united energies of mankind directed by creative intelligence. Never before in the history of the religions did men see the task so clearly. Never before in human history did they have in their hands the scientific tools they now possess. Never before did they have the eyes of science to see and analyze the problems as they can now do. Never before was it possible to control material resources as it is now possible. Never before was it possible to gather human energies about a task as it is now possible to organize it. Never before in the history of the world did the outstanding leaders of the great religions see the religious task and ideal through the same eyes and in the same terms as they do today. It may be that the future may realize the dream and lure that glorious music out of life which has eluded and escaped the toiling children of men through the long centuries of the past. Religious men will at least enlist for one more effort to make spiritual values dominant in human civilization, to embody in world organization the religion of humanity."

—A. Eustace Haydon.
In *Humanist Sermons.*

Psychology and Humanism

E. BURDETTE BACKUS

Psychology, though confessedly still in the creeping stage as a science, has already disclosed itself as an invaluable ally of Humanism. It is busily engaged in writing a new chapter in the philosophy of Naturalism, giving an account in terms of functional origin of those mysteries of the mind which are the last refuge of theologians. It is even more busily employed in developing a new technique by means of which many of the most stubborn ills of man are being made to yield and his well-being greatly augmented.

Dr. Franz Alexander in his book, *The Psychoanalysis of the Total Personality,* says:

"Thus the eternal riddle of biology, namely the logic of the structure of the body in all its anatomical and physiologic arrangements, arrangements which give the impression as though the body had been designed by an understanding intelligence, finds ready solution. The body was in truth constructed by a wise genius; not, however, by an outside genius but by one which dwells within and has always dwelt there. The body with all its arrangements constitutes the fossilized descendant of former individual psychical achievements in the struggle for adaptation. In the course of biological evolution the psyche becomes converted into the body."

This explanation of the wonders of the body in terms of inner achievement rather than external design applies with equal cogency to the marvelous mechanism of the mind. Psychology is making it clear that this also is the work of a genius that dwells within. A brief study of the origin of conscience makes this abundantly evident. Traditional theology has announced that conscience is "the voice of God in the soul of man." Our new science has actually traced the origin of conscience in individual experience.

Shakespeare in one of his sonnets says: "Conscience is born of love." There is, according to the psychologists, more insight in this line of poetry than in all the speculations on the supernatural source of our inner monitor. Conscience comes into being in the babe by virtue of its desire to command the approval and retain the love of its parents and the other members of the home. The infant, and the young child, builds up a pattern of conduct the purpose of which is to accomplish this end; conscience is most literally "born of love." At first the decisions are on the conscious level, but gradually, in the interest of a conservation of psychic energy, they are relegated to a deeper level where they function automatically; conscience attains the status of an independent organ of the inner life. This it is that gives its commands such a peculiar potency and makes them seem as though they were issued from on high.

This is obviously an over-simplified account of an exceedingly complicated process, but it is essentially true. There is no doubt that conscience is to be explained entirely in terms of the function it has to perform in the life of the individual in whom it is established and that no *Deus ex machina* is required to account for it. The same holds true of all the other aspects of our mind—emotions, ideals, religious yearnings. With increasing clarity psychology is making it evident that a wholly naturalistic account of their origin and function is within our reach. This, of course, does not banish the mystery from them. The whole process by which they come into being is one to command awe in the sensitive mind, but the mystery is brought down out of the skies and comes close home.

There are some very practical consequences of the change that is taking place in men's thinking at this point. Sir Arthur Keith, the distinguished British scientist, has made the statement that "The leading neurologists of the world are agreed that the brain is not a tenement inhabited by a spirit or soul. . . . It is only when they abandoned the dual conception that they began to understand the disorders of men's minds and how to treat them." The contrast between the intelligent way in which the insane are treated today in the most progressive institutions for their care and the treatment that was accorded them a few decades ago is a good index of the advance that has been made in consequence of the insight of psychology into the nature of the mind.

The related field of delinquency is likewise being reëxamined in the light of the new science, with revolutionary results. The approach to the whole subject of misdemeanor and crime which grows out of the understanding fostered by the naturalistic theory of the mental life is far more humane and promising than anything that has preceded it. A good example of this is provided in Healy and Bronner's recent book, *New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment.*

A growing multitude of individuals are being returned to a normal and happy life because severe personality problems have yielded to a process of reëducation under the tutelage of a specialist versed in the lore of the genesis of such difficulties. One of these fortunates, a young man who had been practically cured of severe stuttering that had afflicted him since childhood, burst out with the statement that now he knew what religious people were talking about when they said that they were born again, because he literally felt like a new man. He added that he was glad that there was no mythology mixed up with the process.

It is not only that the sick in mind are being helped, but also a great preventive field is opening up. As we learn better what the process of mental development is, the conditions that are most favorable to it, we shall be able to avoid some of the mistakes that in the past have had tragic consequences in the characters of men and women. We shall be more fully aware of what it is that we want to achieve in human personality and how it is to be attained. To be sure we must discipline our hopes to restraint because we are still only in the initial stages of an exceedingly complex and difficult field; but we are making progress.

Then there is the whole field of the social relations of men—their economic and political life, the contacts of nation with nation, of race with race—to which we have as yet scarcely begun to apply the insight of psychology. No one who is acquainted with the penetrating way it has probed to the hidden springs of individual action can doubt that it will prove a potent friend of the developing social sciences which are seeking to make intelligible, and so, perchance, subject to a measure of control, the larger movements of human life.

We are seeing in our day the rounding out of a process that began several centuries ago. Copernicus,

Galileo, and their kin first brought the stars and atoms within the pale of the natural; then Darwin and his brother biologists brought the living world, including man, within its bounds; and now the psychologists of our day are pioneering in bringing mind within the same order. All the sciences are warp and woof of one web. The spinning of the old threads continues, and the new one is adding fresh strength and lustre to the texture. Humanism rejoices in all of them; courageously accepts the intellectual consequences of their findings; seeks to avail itself of their varied skills; and to inform the whole living structure of which they are a part with its own poignant concern for the values of human life.

A Philosophy of Sportsmanship

CORLISS LAMONT

The most significant point about Humanism is, in my opinion, that it is essentially a philosophy of *sportsmanship*. The use of this particular word in relation to philosophy may be thought by some strange or even undignified. But I am unable to find a better term to express what is in my mind.

I mean that Humanism puts the outcome of man's career in this world entirely up to man. The great supernatural religions and most of the traditional philosophies have always postulated a cosmic guaranty for the ultimate triumph of man or his values. They may have admitted or even emphasized that man must go through a long, hard struggle, but they have always promised in advance that he would win or that at least the Good in general would win.

Humanism, however, believes in no Divine Providence guiding the destinies of mankind or the universe to a necessarily successful conclusion. Humanism believes that man has the courage and the ability and the intelligence to win the battle, but it also believes there is a possibility of his losing and losing permanently. Humanism encourages us to play the game boldly and well, come what may, but it does not coddle us like pampered children by saying that we are sure to gain the victory. That is why I call Humanism a philosophy of sportsmanship. That is why Humanism is for mature people and why it grows increasingly stronger with the maturity of the race.

It is clear that the philosophy of Humanism, since it rules out personal survival after death and limits the individual to a definite time-span, recognizes that any human life may be a failure. This philosophy also holds that moral values are an outgrowth of human activity and that there is no transcendental realm where such values can be preserved. Hence, if man ends up by being a moral failure, the great ethical ideals go down to defeat with him. Likewise, since Humanism realizes that some cosmic catastrophe or breakdown in the sources of energy may one day bring extinction to all life on this earth, it has to face the possibility that mankind and everything it achieves or stands for may finally be swept into the discard by the stupendous forces of an uncaring Nature.

Stoicism, one of the outstanding philosophies of courage in history, laid great emphasis of course on playing the game. No matter what your position in life, whether that of an emperor or slave, you were to accept the role assigned and act it out to the best of your ability. But even Stoicism offered its sugar-coating. For if you performed your function well, you were working with *Phusis,* a sort of Bergsonian *Élan Vital* ever striving towards perfection, an alive and purposeful natural law or world-force that could with real accuracy be called *God.* Thus the Stoic could at least feel that the law of Phusis would surely triumph and that his playing the game was part of an upward, onward march in things that would go on for all eternity.

Turning to a most important non-religious movement of contemporary times, we find the Communists following a life-affirming ethic of loyalty to all mankind with a courage and devotion unsurpassed in history. Yet orthodox Communism insists that the triumph of its cause is inevitable, that the coming of proletarian revolution throughout the earth is guaranteed in the dialectical movement of existing economic and social forces. Though Karl Marx may well have been talking about the inevitability of the revolution in a hortatory sense and though Communists are the last persons in the world to sit idly by waiting for the inevitable to happen, the official doctrine none the less does claim that the victory of the workers is ultimately assured. Thus, while there is definitely no element of the supernatural about Communism, its position on inevitability goes far beyond any legitimate scientific prediction and seems to represent in a new form a very old philosophical idea.

But Humanism never loads the dice. Though unceasing in its efforts to build a better world, it refuses to indulge in wish-fulfilment and to read the actualization of its ideals into the stars, the drift of history, or some Divine Mind. It understands that in the past, in a precarious world where man was constantly at the mercy of the natural elements, these theories may have been of real psychological advantage in boosting the morale of the race. Today, however, there is no longer need to assume that mankind has an inferiority complex which must be forever nursed.

While finding, then, no sanction for men's aims either in the history of this earth or in the constitution of the universe-at-large, Humanism is at the same time full of optimism. In the tremendous achievements of the human race so far, it sees inherent the substantial possibility of almost infinite progress. Looking very far into the future Humanism declines to accept that doom for man and his earth prophesied by medieval theologians and modern astronomers. It believes that the advance of science and of social coöperation may result in such further conquests of Nature that human life and culture will be indefinitely prolonged on this planet. This would indeed constitute a glorious immortality. Here again it is up to man; he may not win through. But the future is open and there is a good sporting chance of victory. Thus Humanism presents an unending challenge to what is best and bravest in the human race.

Humanism and Character

ERNEST CALDECOTT

And now abideth theism, humanism, and character, and the greatest of these is character. Without entering into an exegesis of Paul's famous "faith, hope and love" dictum, we may assert that the great test of any philosophy is what it makes of a man. If any kind of belief suffices for building character, or if there be no relation between the two, then all we secure from one form of thought as against another is a little more or less intellectual exercise. This is not true, however, for in the long run a rigid loyalty to facts, and an equally rigorous effort to determine the values of those facts for human living, constitute no small part of what finally makes character. To follow this thought through would require more space than is allotted to this article. Attention is called to it because we are inclined to judge results rather superficially. Nor can we omit mention of the necessity of fidelity to whatever is true, even if it could be shown that such an attitude has nothing to do with the moral and ethical effects of all acts, physical and mental.

As already implied there is no substitute for character. Paraphrasing Paul again, if a man discovers the most epoch making laws of the Universe, and sacrifices his life for their application, but fails of simple duties to his fellow men, it profiteth him nothing. Many a simple peasant, who has never heard of physics, chemistry, psychology, and the social sciences, contributes far more richly to the things that make our earthly existence worth while than does the learned pedagogue or scientist who lacks the milk of human kindness. But it does not follow that we are justified in adopting the maxim, "be good, sweet maiden; let whoever will be clever."

That which is most greatly needed today in the development of character is a certain discernment of the relation between facts and values. The evil good men do and the still greater evil they unwittingly permit others to do bear a much closer approximation to decay in civilization than most of us are aware. By and large, the ordinary individual is quite good at heart. But this serves him in little better stead in the great affairs of society than his forbears' naive acceptance of the Ptolemaic theory of the Universe, or wearing an amulet to ward off disease. Indeed, it is probably not too much to assert that modern demagogues depend more upon the native goodness of the majority of people than upon anything else, in order to carry out their nefarious purposes. The simple-hearted are usually the most credulous. Not only do they bear, with patience, the ills inflicted upon them, but they appear to be possessed of a fadeless hope of a better day, if not here then hereafter. This is scarcely the type of character it is desirable to develop.

There is no implication here that theism leads to the ruination of character and that humanism would make the ideal actual, although it is to be observed that down through the ages divine sanctions have been inculcated to justify the inhumanity of man to man. It was largely in revolt against this unethical concept of deity that the Unitarian movement arose, so that to this day we see the purest form of theism among Unitarians. At the moment, among liberal orthodox churches, and almost entirely among unorthodox liberal theists, even where theistic terms are used it is more for psychological and poetic purposes than because appeals to deity are expected to start objective universal forces moving which would otherwise be unresponsive. Not only is the emphasis obviously for character formation, but many theists readily admit that a theistic prayer, recast in humanistic terms, constitutes a distinction without an essential difference.

A two-fold achievement can now alone vindicate religious humanism, and both are character-forming. The one is a personal loyalty to the highest values we can conceive, and the other is social fidelity. It is passing strange that so many men and women should exult in praises to Jehovah (single or multiple), including a high estimation of their own worth, and yet, in effect, hold to the theory of "original sin" for the bulk of mankind. That there are native differences among us, even in the same race, none will question. That these differences justify a sort of theological snobbery does not follow. In the Jeffersonian sense "all men are created equal." The reason we treat a new born babe different from a ten-year-old boy, and the latter different again when he is twenty, is not because of anything inherent, as we all well know. Nor is there justification for using less gifted persons as means to our ends simply because such men and women can never originate projects for themselves. It is one thing to engage in a coöperative society, by means of a division of labor, even including differentials in compensation, but quite another to argue that since some cannot lead they must follow at our pleasure.

The importance of personal and social character, the distinction between the two, and their final identity, as character, is worth stressing. The concept of goodness held by most people is rather an inane affair. It consists largely in abstaining from acts frowned upon by the community (the "mores" or customs of the times), together with kindly deeds which are native to the unspoiled individual. Far from decrying such goodness we should be quick to command it if that is as far as acumen can take men and women. What is needed now is intellectual-moral discrimination so that our acts will be more far-reaching for good. Personal character has to do with individual deeds and their motivations. A man may be socially active in much that is good for others, but if he is not personally honorable and kind he still lacks some properties of sound character. On the other hand, one who pays his debts and is a good neighbor but who neglects the vital social problems affecting others is also minus some character qualities. Not only are both personal and social goodness needed, but, in the long run, they together, in their integration, make a unified personality. There can be no making up on the one side whatever is missing on the other.

In the case of early Unitarians it used to be said, by the orthodox, that while they were good people their goodness was only "filthy rags" as a condi-

tion of admission into the next world. Liberal theists of today, at any rate, admit that goodness is goodness wherever found, and that something additional (to say nothing of substituting "saving faith" for deeds) is as foolish as painting the lily. What is justly required of Humanists is a practical demonstration in daily living that their philosophy be more productive of all-round rich character qualities than any other. On the rational side of being intellectually true to the facts of nature they have all the advantage. It is demanded of Humanists, beyond all others, that they be persons of the finest integrity, penetrating deeply and diffusing broadly, so that they not only live the good life themselves, and thus become a contagious example for others, but also add to the possibilities of richer living on the part of those who come after them. Less than this is not yet Humanism.

Hitching a Church to a Star

HAROLD P. MARLEY

A church where the minister wears a tuxedo, looks like a movie star, and surrounds himself with a halo of charts and symbols, is the Temple of Light in downtown Detroit. His extemporaneous discourse with many Biblical allusions, sounds like a sermon and is followed by applause from the three hundred people who come three nights a week to the made-over shrine of this star cult. This is but one more manifestation of the confusion in religious faith which has followed the Southern white north to the automobile cities. With urban industrial ways estopping the traditional individualism of these people, they have turned to the one thing left—religion. The building of tabernacles and the calling of native Southern ministers to fill their pulpits has been one manifestation of the desire to find an outlet along traditional lines. Movements in areas of Southern white concentration can get started in a lodge hall or an abandoned church building, such as is occupied by the Temple of Light. The Church of God, the Christian and Missionary Alliance, the Fellowship of Truth, and the Temple of Truth all make their particular appeal to the spiritually weary.

J. Frank Norris of Texas was invited to Detroit to slay the dragon of anti-Christ, ever at work among the faithful, and is now engaged in erecting a second tabernacle to the Lord. The first is on property loaned by the General Motors Company and cost $25,000. Other preachers came to hold evangelistic services and remained to shepherd flocks of their own. The unmistakable accent of the hills can be heard in some of the old established pulpits, but it is almost universal in the areas of the poorly-housed, poorly-paid Protestant workers.

"Forty percent of the people in church on Sunday are from the South," was the claim of one man who preaches in an IOOF Hall on Sunday and works in the sheriff's office during the week. Since the automobile cities have practically doubled their population every decade since 1910, and inasmuch as many of the newcomers were from the hills, knobs, and dales of Kentucky and Tennessee, I could almost believe him. Certainly, many in the Temple of Light had apparently originated there, and had graduated from the Tabernacle to the Temple. It offered something different, if not bizarre.

The first Sunday of the year, when I attended the service, was the logical time to make predictions for the coming months, and the congregation was not disappointed. Following a forthright appeal to have faith in God and prayer, and to beware of the preachers, who offered nothing more than this alone, the man in the tuxedo explained what was in the horoscope of America in the winter court of Aries. We learned, first of all, that Abraham held intercourse with the stars and that science was coming to the assistance of the astrologer. At Rockefeller Institute, he said, dots and dashes had been intercepted coming from the vicinity of Jupiter.

"Don't be egotistical," he warned. "This is not the center of the universe. Betelgeuse could contain twenty-five millions of our suns."

When he began to unfold the future, people watched his every move with an "if thou wilt" look in their eyes. Here was fortune-telling en masse, and more inexpensive than going to a clairvoyant on a side street.

"There will be a national trend, due to the influence of the sun, which will enrich the entire nation . . . but look out! Saturn and Neptune will be a bad influence in industry. There will be radical changes between capital and labor."

What would he say about the labor question? With forty thousand General Motors employees out of work, and other thousands who had just gone back to work or were ready to sit-down if so ordered by the Union, there was a general straining to hear.

"Labor will come into its own . . . but not through violence or war-like methods . . . only through a better understanding of conditions. The millionaire will have to pay more taxes than ever before . . . even more than for the social security legislation, when Roosevelt and the wild Congressmen get to work in Washington."

So far, so good. A prognosticator must play safe, especially one who had just boasted that he had made no errors and had said: "If I do make a mistake, the fault is in my feeble brain, not the stars, beyond the reach of my corrupting hands."

"Under the influence of Uranus, there will be a new invention in the early months. It will startle the industrial world and cause a lot of trouble."

What, specifically could it be? It would be something which "will put gravity, buoyancy, starlight, and wind," to work in a rhapsody of planned economy.

His talk had a familiar ring; only, his predictions had nothing to do with the second coming of Christ. They did, very definitely, tie into the old millennial gospel, but had the added authority of a pseudo-scientific lingo. Other ministers had pounded their pulpits and made predictions, but nothing happened. This man, called by his assistant, *The Message of Light*, at least had the stars on his side. Stars can be

seen, and the book which he waved in the air, could tell you things about yourself. Merely give the date and hour of your birth, as one woman did, and he could by reference to the position of the stars at that moment, tell:

> That there had been the death of a loved one,
> That there had been or would be a tonsilectomy,
> That there was a situation in the home which required great fortitude of spirit,
> And that there had been, or would have to be, a major operation in the vital organs.

Astrology, dressed up in a tuxedo, may not be the solution of our modern problems, but some individuals find it refreshing. They gladly make pledges to the work, or drop coins in the collection plate (*The Message of Light* leaves the platform during this formality) and even pay a dollar for a book on the subject, sold at the rear of the church. The usher, who invited me to come back, confided in me that "it helps you in your business." Added to the traditional cross, which the Temple has wired for red lights, is a large star with blue lights. The astrology charts, which flank the pulpit on either side, and the choir perched above in blue gowns with silver collars certainly provide a change from traditional Christian symbolism.

Two years before, in this same church, the Black Legion was dominating the picture. Originally the Central Christian Church, it fell into the hands of the Detroit Trust Company when the congregation moved to Woodward Avenue, and has since fallen prey to any cult or sect which could raise two hundred dollars a month. The story of the common-law wife of Trigger-man Dayton Dean, who revealed many of the secrets of the dark Legion, incorporated a good deal about the church which the men had decided to organize as a blind for their activities. In order to pay the rent, the women, led by Mrs. Harvey Davis, resorted to all the pie-supper money-raising tricks so well known to church ladies. The men, she said, stole materials from where they worked and labored nights to put the heating plant and other parts of the church in good repair.

It was in this Little Stone Chapel, as it was then called, that members were initiated into the order of the Black Legion, and much of the nefarious activity was plotted. Maurice Sugar, liberal attorney who was on the death list of the Legion, said that the plans for upsetting his political campaign and finally plotting his death were laid in this church.

Church establishments, which follow their membership into the newer sections of a city, may have no responsibility for what happens to the old building, but they do have a liability in the case of the population which moves into the old neighborhood. It may be indirect, through concerning itself in the industrial, educational, or recreational conditions, but viewed from recent events in Detroit, indifference is certainly untenable. False shepherds, like this *Message of Light* who claims he was once a down-and-outer who rose to his present position after trying successively Catholicism, Methodism, Lutheranism, and nine other creeds, are bound to mislead the hungry who come seeking bread. Blaming everything on the stars, including a family quarrel, is a convenient kind of astral Calvinism, but zodiacal spinning wheel charts and a vocabulary of "trines" and "sextiles" only lead to that chaos which these astrologers think they behold in conjunction with the planet Mars.

With seventeen prominent Detroiters—including a State Senator—in jail for a voting fraud, a bank scandal, a Black Legion exposé, and the most gigantic labor struggle which has ever occurred in American history, it is a strategic time for vital religion to assert itself. If ever there was a prophetic era, or a northern Bethel for an Amos from the south country, this is the time, and Detroit is the place to let in the light.

My Russian Impressions*

RABINDRANATH TAGORE

Translated from the Original Bengali by Basanta Koomar Roy

Copyright, 1937, by Basanta Koomar Roy
Author of "Rabindranath Tagore: The Man and His Poetry"

VIII.

I have returned from Russia. Now I am on my way to America. I had only one object in going to Russia; I wanted to see with my own eyes for a short while how the Russians were carrying on their program of popular education; and what was the concrete result of this new education.

I think that the only foundation of the sky-scraping mountains of sorrow that stand on the very heart of India is non-education. The caste system, the religious feuds, the lethargy of inertia, the national poverty—all these are the fruits of the dearth of education in our country. The Simon Commission exhausted the list of all the faults of India; but in the end admitted the existence of only one fault of the British rule in India. And that was the inadequate provision for the spread of education. This was enough. Suppose one says that the householder has not learned to take care of himself; that whenever he tries to go from one room to another he stumbles on the threshold and falls on the ground; that he constantly loses things and then fails to find them; that he calls a shadow a ghost and is afraid to look at it; and that he fails to recognize his own brother and lifts a stick to strike him as a burglar; that he hates to leave his bed; that he has not even the courage to walk about; that he is hungry and yet searches for his food in vain; that every avenue of life is closed to him except blind dependence on fate—consequently that householder cannot be trusted with the management of his own household affairs—and then the accuser whispers: "But I have myself put out the light in this home." What would you think of such a man?

There was a time when the people of the West were wont to burn innocent women as witches; killed the

*Written in the period of 1930.—Editors.

scientists as dangerous sinners; most cruelly terrorized over any difference of religious opinion; curtailed the political rights of the followers of other churches of their own religion; and besides we can quote heaps of deeds of blind bigotry, arrant ignorance and vicious usages from the pages of the history of the Middle Ages. But pray tell me—how did these deeds become things of the past? They were certainly not dependent upon an outside trusteeship for the reformation of their faults. The one great power that liberated them was—*education.*

By dint of this very education Japan has succeeded in such a short time in adjusting the political power of the country with the will and the endeavors of the people at large. They have tremendously increased the wealth-producing capacity of the nation. Modern Turkey is making such rapid strides in education that she is fairly advanced on the way of liberating herself from the terrific burden of blind religious bigotry. But "India alone in slumber lies." For light is forbidden to enter the house—the light that awakens the modern world, yes, that light of education is shining outside the closed doors of India.

When I started for Russia I did not expect much; for the samples of what was possible and what impossible I had occasion to observe in British India. The story of the stupendous difficulty in improving conditions in India has been most pathetically told to the whole world by the Christian missionary Thompson. I have had to admit this myself; otherwise why should we be in such an anomalous predicament? I knew that it was much more difficult to improve the condition of the masses in Russia than in India. Those that belonged to the middle and the lower classes in Russia were, both inwardly and outwardly, in the same boat with the corresponding classes in India. They were equally illiterate, equally helpless, equally superstitious in religion and priestcraft, equally stupid from indebtedness, equally unclean in self-respect, being smeared with the dust from the feet of their superiors; equally deprived of the facilities and comforts of this scientific age; equally ghost-ridden with the spirits of their forefathers; equally most tightly bound by these ghosts to the same unshakable pillars of ages ago. And, again, the Russians were bestially and infinitely cruel to their Jewish neighbors. They were quite competent in receiving lashes from their superiors, as they were ready to inflict unjust tyranny upon their equals.

That is how they were before. The rulers of Soviet Russia today do not control as much wealth as the British Raj. They have been administering the affairs of Russia only since 1917. They have had neither the time nor the means to ripen their strategic governmental principles. They are on all sides surrounded by enemies both at home and abroad. Not only the British, but even the Americans have secretly and openly endeavored to support the civil wars in Soviet Russia. The rulers of this nation have resolved to make their masses both educated and powerful. And certainly the difficulty of their difficulties is infinitely more difficult than that of the British rulers in India.

So it would have been quite improper for me to expect to see much in Russia. How can we have even a strong hope when we know so little; and have seen much less? I certainly went to Russia with a feeble hope so poorly nursed in our sorrowful land. But I have been simply overpowered with wonder at what I saw in Russia. No doubt I did not have sufficient time to investigate as to how "law and order" was being observed in this land. I learn, however, that there is enough rigour in the administration of "law and order." At times, I hear, they quickly punish a man without a trial. The Russians enjoy freedom in everything except going against the will of the rulers. But this is only speaking of the dark spots on the moon. The main purpose of my visit to Russia was to study the light of the moon. And I certainly saw a glorious light on this moon . . . Those that were paralyzed and inert are today stirring with a new life.

It is said that there are places of pilgrimage in Europe where born cripples, by divine grace, cast aside their crutches in a moment. That is exactly what has happened in Russia. In no time they are constructing high-speed chariots from the woods of their castaway crutches. In ten years' time those that were worse than pedestrians have become charioteers. They have proudly lifted up their heads in human society. They are masters of their own intelligence; they are masters of their own hands; and they are masters of their own machines.

The English missionaries have spent much time in India. They are thoroughly acquainted with the immense impediments in the way of progress in that country. They should now come to Moscow. But that will not do them much good; for it is their professional habit to look especially into the seamy side of a society. They are blind to light; specially when the light comes from a source toward which they are antagonistic. They seem to forget that one needs no telescopes to discover the black spots on the moon of their government.

I am about seventy years old now. So far I have not lost my patience. I have always blamed our own fate as I have observed the unbearably heavy burden of ignorance in our country. It cannot be denied that I have in my own humble way done my best to correct these evils. But the chariot of my faint hope has made less progress than it has cost in broken ropes and broken wheels. I even drowned all my own pride for the sake of the sorrows of my fellow countrymen. I asked for help from the British government officials. They patted me on the back. But the alms they gave me was enough only to make me lose my caste; and at the same time not do much good. But the most painful and the most sorrowful thing is the fact that the Indian flunkies of the British have opposed me most. The greatest malady of a conquered country is the poison of mutual jealousy, the poison of narrowness, and the poison of the contamination of the opposition to one's own country's welfare.

High above all the outside activities of a human being is his soul culture. We cannot fully appreciate the value of soul culture when our minds become turbid with the turmoil of the affairs of finance and politics. Thus soul force wanes. I am much threatened with this danger. That is the reason why I want to embrace and cling to the Real. Some ridicule me; and some get angry with me; and they all want me to follow their own paths. But I do not know from where I have come on my pilgrimage to this earth. My path is near the altar of the deity of my pilgrimage. The deity of my own life has initiated me into recognizing and bowing before the deity of Mankind. When I am armed with that armour, then the peoples of all the races offer me seats of respect; and listen to my words with attention. But when I stand with the mask of India on my face,

I encounter countless obstacles. When they look upon me as a man, right then they honor me as an Indian; but when I want to pass merely as an Indian, then they cannot honor me as a man. My path of life becomes rough when I make the mistake of following the laws of narrow nationalism. I have but a few more years on this planet; so I have to follow the path of truth, and not the path of popularity.

My impressions of Russia indirectly reach India in various forms of truths, half truths, and untruths. And I feel disgusted with myself when I cannot always remain indifferent to these reports. I am constantly reminded of the fact that I am sure to encounter grave danger if I behave like a householder in my age, quite ripe for the hermitage. However that may be, I read much and heard much about the enormous difficulties of Russia. Now I have seen with my own eyes the picture of how they have surmounted those difficulties in Soviet Russia.

IX.

Those of our countrymen who look upon politics as a mere form of wrestling invariably look upon the fine arts as something opposed to manliness. I have already written on this subject before. The Czar of Russia was like the demon king Ravana of the Ramayana. His empire was like a huge python. It devoured large parts of the surface of the earth. And it crushed many countries to the dust.

About thirteen years ago the Russian revolutionists came into conflict with this titanic power. When the Czar and his family were put out of the way, the Czarists came out fighting for the restoration of the throne. The imperialistic nations of the world supplied these Czarists with arms, ammunition, and enthusiasm. Now you can easily understand that it was not very clear sailing for the Russian Revolutionists. The satellites of the Czar, the rich, the powerful landowners were in immeasurable difficulty. Their properties were snatched away and plundered by the farmers; and the farmers became almost insane with the desire to destroy all their paraphernalia of luxury. In those days of most turbulent turmoil the revolutionary leaders ordered: "Let no one by any means destroy any things of art." So the half-starved and cold-afflicted revolutionists in companies rescued all the things of art from the deserted homes of the wealthy, and gathered them in the museums of the universities.

Do you remember what we saw in China? How the imperialists destroyed the spring palace of Peiping? How they tore, plundered, scattered to the winds, and burned to ashes the rarest art treasures of China? Such treasures of art can never be created again on this earth. The Bolsheviks deprived the rich of their personal properties; but they never allowed, like savages, the treasures of art to be destroyed; for they belonged to humanity forever. For long the farmers were wont to cultivate the land for the luxurious living of others. The Bolsheviks have not only given the farmers the ownership of their own farms; but they have also given them all the things that are valuable for knowledge and pleasure in human life. Food for the stomach is enough only for beasts—and not for human beings. They understand the truth of this statement; and they have openly admitted that for the development of true manhood in man, art culture is much more important than physical culture.

It is true that during the revolution many things that were in the upper stories came down to the lower levels. But the things in themselves were not destroyed. And today, as a result, the museums are full, the theaters are full, the libraries are full, and full are the academies of music.

In Russia, just as in India, the works of the artists were chiefly exhibited in the temples. The priests of the Russian church capriciously controlled these objects of art with their profound lack of refined taste. Just as the newly educated devotees of our country have not hesitated to whitewash the temples of Puri, even so the masters of the churches here, according to their own culture, covered the ancient glories with their own superstitions. They never thought that the historical value of these ancient glories belonged to all for all time. They even recast the things of worship according to their own limited culture. In India, too, we have many historically precious things in our temples and monasteries. No one can use them. And the Brahmin priests themselves are steeped in abysmal ignorance. They have neither the education nor the intelligence to make use of them. I have come to know from Khiti Babu that many old manuscripts are today confined in numerous temples all over India. Like the princess in the abodes of the demons, there is no way of rescuing them.

The Russian revolutionists have broken the sacred walls around the church properties, and have turned them into public property. They have kept only the things of worship in the churches; and the rest have found shelter in the museums. Here in those days of the civil war when the country was infested with an epidemic of typhoid fever, when the railway lines were torn up, yes, even then the Russian scientific research societies did travel in the remotest ends of the provinces and combed the entire countryside for the rescue and the collection of the ancient treasures of art. Thus endless quantities of manuscripts, paintings, and engravings were gathered.

This speaks only of the treasures discovered in the wealthy homes and the churches. Then they became engaged in assessing the value of the hitherto neglected arts of the peasants and the workers. And they soon became intensely busy with folk literature and folk songs.

After the collection of these things began the education of the people in relation to these collections. I am writing you all these things because I want my countrymen to know that only ten years ago the masses of the Russian people were in no way superior to the masses of India today. And I want them also to know how lofty is the ideal of the Soviet rulers to make true men out of such people by means of education. In this Soviet system of education you will find included the teaching of science, literature, music, and painting. In other words, this system of mass education in Russia is more complete than the British system of education that is meant to educate even the so-called gentlemen of India.

I read in the newspapers that in connection with primary education in India, the British government has recently ordered that the revenue must be extorted from the farmers; and the land-owners have been entrusted with the right of collection. In other words, the farmers who are all but dead in India have to be further tortured in the name of education.

Of course, the school taxes must be levied; otherwise how can expenditure be met? But why should not all pay taxes for a thing that is good for the country as a whole? In India there are also the members of the

Indian Civil Service; there are members of the military service; and then there are the governors and the Viceroy, and the members of their councils—why should not their full pockets be touched for a thing like this? Don't the English officials in India get paid from the taxes these farmers pay?—and don't they finally get their pensions from the same source to enable them to retire and enjoy their lives in their homes beyond the seas? Are not the big British jute merchants in India in any way responsible for the education of the starving jute farmers on whose very life-blood they build their unwieldy fortunes to be sent away to their country, far, far away from our shores?

There are ministers who show great enthusiasm, in full stomach, over the passage of a bill on education. Why should not they be made to pay even a penny's worth of price from their own pockets for such demonstrations of enthusiasm for education? Is this love for education?

I am myself a land-owner. I spend a little for the primary education of my *ryots*. And if necessary, I am ready to pay gladly two or three times over. But every day the farmers should be made to understand that I am their fellow countryman. In their education is my welfare, and I am paying for it; but not a single one of the British officials, from the top to the bottom, is paying even a penny.

In Soviet Russia the pressure for the improvement of the condition of the masses is very high. For this the people are suffering from no common privations. But the privations are equally shared by the highest and the lowest in the land.

But I cannot call this privation privation at all—it is devotional consecration!

The British government has at last been willing to wipe away its disgrace of 200 years by introducing a particle of education in India in the name of primary education; and yet the price has to be paid by those who are least able to pay; and not by the ambitious sycophants of the British Raj. They are there only to enjoy the glory of it all!

Had it not been for the fact that I have seen things in Russia with my own eyes, I could never have believed that within only ten years' time, they have succeeded in lifting millions of human beings from the lowest depths of illiteracy and humiliation, and, then, have not only taught them A B C, but have glorified them with the diadem of true manhood. The rulers of Soviet Russia are not exclusively busy with the masses of their own race. They are equally anxious to uplift the members of other races. And yet the sectarian theologians call them irreligious. Does religion reside only in the verses of the scriptures? Does God dwell only in the churches? Can God exist anywhere near those who habitually cheat their brother man?

I have so much to tell you! I am not accustomed to gathering materials to do my writing. But I am writing these things for I am absolutely convinced that it would be wrong on my part not to do so. I have promised myself to gradually write more and more about the Russian system of education. Times without number I have thought that, beside visiting other countries, you all should come to Russia to see all things. Many British spies from India go there. The Indian revolutionists, too, go back and forth. But I think it is urgently necessary for us to go to Russia to study their system of education. We do not have to go there for anything else.

However, I do not feel encouraged to tell you anything about myself. I am afraid the pride of my paintings may threaten to be strengthened in my mind. But so far I have allowed the praise of my paintings to affect me only outwardly. It has not yet reached my heart. I constantly think that the praise has been accidental—I did not deserve it.

I am now floating in mid-ocean. I do not know what awaits my fate on the other shore. My body is tired; and my mind is unwilling. The heaviest thing in the world is the empty begging bowl. When, when shall I be able to finally surrender my begging bowl to the Lord, and then enjoy a vacation?

[*To be continued*]

The Study Table

The Use and Abuse of History

THE DISCUSSION OF HUMAN AFFAIRS. *By Charles A. Beard. New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. $1.75.*

The title of this book scarcely indicates its matter, which really concerns what Nietzsche would have called "the use and abuse of history." For Nietzsche the use and abuse were seen to affect not only the study of history but also the formation of the personal and national character. For Professor Beard the use and abuse of history are more narrowly considered, as they affect the discussion of human affairs.

Readers who are familiar with the author's own discussions of human affairs will take up this book with special interest because of its bearing on the uses and abuses to which his own historical studies have been put by certain of his disciples who have been hotter than he "after certainties." Indeed, now that the adjective "Beardean" is, at least momentarily, working its way into the American language, as synonymous with the economic interpretation of history, it is well that we should learn from Professor Beard himself just what the adjective should mean. That Professor Beard does not accept the theory of economic interpretation as alone adequate should be evident to all who are familiar with his numerous more technical writings on historiography. That many readers should, however, believe him to be an "economic interpreter" is readily understandable, for if one does not detect in such books as *The Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* and *The Rise of American Civilization* a doctrinaire acceptance and application of the theory of economic interpretation, one does at least find a persistent focussing of attention on the economic factors in national history. And yet, from time to time Professor Beard has reiterated the view that economic interpretation furnishes *only one* structure for grouping, however "illuminating and surprising in many ways" that method of studying history may be. If there are those who would say that he has come perilously near "abusing" history in his emphasis on this method, he would reply, as he has done recently in the preface to the new edition of *The Economic Interpretation of the Constitution*, that "since this aspect has been so long disregarded, I sought to redress the balance by emphasis."

But if Professor Beard's emphasis in his historical

researches has been motivated by a desire "to redress the balance" as a corrective for a previous neglect of the economic factors on the part of many historians, the book under review represents an attempt to offer a corrective of yet another "abuse." We had thought that the "economic interpreters" were today in the saddle, but Professor Beard insists that "the mathematicians and physicists have hitherto monopolized the super-reflections of the Anglo-Saxon world . . . Whitehead, Jeans, Eddington, and Bertrand Russell, for example, have recently carried the methods, symbols, and conceptions of their world over into the discussion of human affairs." Hence, there are now new balances to be redressed. And Professor Beard believes that the thing needful can and should be done by the "historiographers"; indeed, he asserts that the discussion of human affairs is "the theme which is their peculiar interest and object of inquiry and speculation."

The book is not, however, intended as a corrective for the "super-reflections" of only the mathematicians and physicists who may today be abusing history. The author is aware of other balances that need redressing as well. For this reason, he begins his analysis of the discussion of human affairs by emphasizing the importance of our recognizing in such discussions the difference between fact and opinion and the differences in opinion that result from the "personal equation," the time, the place, and the purpose of our discussions. Each of these conditioning factors is discussed in a lively and simple fashion and pertinent examples of prejudice arising out of their neglect are given. It is in his criticism of historical theories based on analogies that his argument comes down menacingly upon the mathematicians and the physicists. Although he alleges that these theories have "collapsed," the author regrets that they still persist in their principal forms, which he lists as three in number: the theory of cause and effect, the theory of cycles, and the theory of organism. The first two of these misconceptions of history derive from mathematics or physics and the third, from biology. The reader must be referred to the book itself for the detailed analysis and criticism of these theories. We wonder, however, if, in asserting that they have "collapsed," the coroner is not guilty of exaggeration, or at least of wishful thinking. Are writers like Arnold Toynbee, Gerald Heard, and Oswald Spengler, (names selected at random from among those historians who utilize these analogies), not to be included among "the contemporary students of historiography," or are these men among the "historians who give little thought to their own operations?"

But the abusers of history are, as we have indicated, not confined to those who employ analogies drawn from physics and biology. Still more discreditable are the "historiographers" who, like Pareto, operate on the naive assumption that they make no assumptions. The paragraphs on Pareto are among the most damaging in the book and we doubt not that the more devout members of the cult of Pareto will soon be rushing to the defence.

If we add to this group of abusers of history those who make "the assumption that all is chaos" and those who employ some form or other of the Jewish-Christian theory of providence or of the conception of the "economic man," or who employ the "great man" theory, the Marxian theory of the class struggle, or the conventional "idea of progress," we shall have some notion of the confusion that is possible in the discussion of human affairs and that Professor Beard attempts here to settle. The author does not, of course, dismiss all of these conceptions entirely. He sees some facet of truth in several of them. For example, one form of the class conception of history "comes into close correspondence with many known and established realities." And as to progress, "unless all history is a senseless *faux pas,* unless we assume chaos and meaninglessness in the time unfoldment of human affairs, we seem bound to accept progress of some kind in some form." It is unnecessary to indicate here the entire catalogue of assumptions that he detects in current discussions of human affairs. Needless to say, he makes no claim to have listed all of them. We wish, however, that he might have found occasion to discuss and evaluate certain types of historiography of greater significance than some of those he deals with, types represented by Dilthey, Troeltsch, Rickert, and Berdyaev, all of which are indispensable for contemporary study in this field. It should be clear, nevertheless, that Professor Beard has again rendered his public a distinguished service in the warning he gives to those who would use history in the discussion of human affairs. He has done much, and in a very readable way, to redress some balances that are badly off center today.

And what are the conclusions of this study, for thought and practice? Just these: that, since any discussion of human affairs can be vitiated by unexamined or false assumptions and since any fully "scientific" treatment of history presupposes omniscience and is therefore impossible, we should not only be more critical of ourselves and others, but a knowledge of the various conditioning factors should also "take the edge off of conceit and bigotry." More than that: those who fight in the light should learn from history that variant positions and points of view overlap and interpenetrate, that there is a sort of dialectic of history and discussion by which "sharpness of division [can be] softened and the way prepared for resolving conflicts by the magic of thought projected into the forum of practice." Aside from these uses of history, the historiographer must content himself with the assurance that he is dependable as a prophet only when he predicts that there will in the future be change and that such change will be the result of a "sifting and accumulation of interests, activities, and ideas, with certain economic activities for the sustenance of life continuing forever in various forms."

There are, no doubt, those who will be disappointed to learn that "this is the supreme contribution of contemporary historiography to the process of coping with present perplexities." But some of us will be grateful that at least one historiographer knows the limits of his calling, that he knows, for example, that concerning "value" judgments "historiography as such is silent," that historiography is "scientific [only] in the sense that it tries to avoid value judgments." And yet, we cannot escape the impression that Professor Beard has set up an ideal impossible of attainment. For one thing, the historiographer must involve himself in "value" judgments the moment he *selects* any set of facts as worthy of record or interpretation. And for another thing, we have already seen that Professor Beard himself feels constrained as an historiographer to "accept progress of some kind in some form." Otherwise, all history must be deemed "a senseless *faux pas.*" In the first case, the historiographer turns out to be an appraiser of values in spite of himself. In the sec-

ond, he deliberately revolts at the idea that history is simply "a sifting and accumulation of interests, activities, and ideas" promising only eternal change.

Hence, after the "supreme contribution of the historiographer" has been made and in widest commonalty spread, after we have come out the same door wherein we went, so far as an appreciation of the *values* resident in human affairs is concerned, we find ourselves, with Professor Beard, (vainly) asking the "scientific" historiographer, "Is history a senseless *faux pas?* And if it is, then why bother with the discussion of human affairs? If not, then what *is* the meaning of history?" Perhaps theology, "the queen of the sciences," is, after all, still queen. J. L. ADAMS.

Bayard Taylor

BAYARD TAYLOR. *By Richard Croom Beatty. 379 pp. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.*

Professor Beatty of the University of Alabama has written the first full-length portrait of Bayard Taylor since Smyth published his biography in 1896. In the meantime more material has come to light, and a new biography is justified.

At any rate, Taylor should not be so easily forgotten. He was, as Beatty points out, "one of the most colorful and popular authors of the nineteenth century." He touched his century in every way, and "did not write a single work which was not influenced in one way or another by his age." Does this mean that "the American way of life" frustrated a great artist and produced only a minor poet, a writer of once popular travel books, and a journalist? Beatty cannot make up his mind. Perhaps that is all to the good: the reader ought to think about Taylor.

Taylor deserves study. Deeply influenced by German thought, he followed in the train of Ticknor, Everett, Hedge, and Longfellow, in interpreting to America the literature of Germany. If he had done nothing beyond his great translation of *Faust* he deserves to live. But he did much more than that: in his widely-read travel books he interpreted the world to America just at the period when the great missionary enthusiasm was beginning; in his poetry he gave us *Faust;* his lectures attracted large audiences in both the East and West; his work as diplomat although of brief duration was in the interest of international good will. Had he but lived to write his projected biography of Goethe, he would have received his due appreciation. No man of the nineteenth century could have better interpreted Goethe than Bayard Taylor.

Taylor was appreciated by the men of his time. Greeley gave him important assignments; Whittier put him with Fields in the *Tent on the Beach*; Bismarck was his admiring friend. But Taylor chose the themes of the hour: travel books, like guide books, quickly become out of date; his novels have no great passion because he chose the golden mean; his lectures were delivered to raise money; his poetry, too, dealt too much with current ideas. Only *Faust* is timeless. Therein lies the key to Taylor.

At last when the prize was within his grasp, when the coveted ambassadorship came to him, when leisure to write his biography of Goethe came, his great body was worn out. A restless American "of the gilded age," he received one consolation: he died in Germany, his spiritual home. Could he have been freed from debt, worry, and journalism; could he have been given time to meditate in the land he loved, he would be counted today one of America's greatest men of letters. If, for example, Taylor could have had the leisure of Henry James, he would be considered his superior. All this was denied to Taylor, but like a soldier he served his own time and was then forgotten. But Bayard Taylor shall yet have a resurrection.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY

The Goal of Religion

VARIETIES OF AMERICAN RELIGION. *Edited by Charles S. Braden. 294 pp. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company. $2.*

In Part I of the book representatives "within Traditional Christianity" have their say: William B. Riley for the Fundamentalists; W. H. Foulkes for Orthodox Protestantism; Ernest F. Tittle for Liberal Protestantism; Edward Scribner Ames for Radical Protestantism; George Craig Stewart for Sacramentarianism; E. G. Homrighausen for Barthianism; and, lastly, Fulton J. Sheen for Roman Catholicism.

In Part II we have "The Goal of Religion as Conceived in Several Modern Religious Movements in America"; John A. Widtsoe for Mormonism; Charles Fillmore, the founder, for Unity (not to be confused with this periodical); Albert F. Gilmore for Christian Science; Horace J. Bridges for Ethical Culture; John H. Dietrich for Humanism; Mark A. Barwise for Spiritualism; and Albert P. Warrington for Theosophy.

Part III does the same for American Judaism: Leo Jung speaking for Orthodox Judaism; Solomon Goldman for National Judaism; and Felix A. Levy for Reformed Judaism. From this it will be seen that here we have a real source book of an authoritative character on the Goal of Religion, as envisioned by these schools. Invaluable for minister or layman who really wants to know from a reliable source just what "the other church teaches!"

In an admirable summary the editor indicates the relative differences between the this-worldly and the other-worldly emphasis of the various contributors. It is significant that the other-worldly emphasis does not appear anywhere nearly as much as a generation ago, even in Roman Catholicism and Orthodox Protestantism. GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE

A Review in Verse

EUROPEAN IMPRESSIONS. *By Kate Crane Gartz; Altadena, California.*

Oh! What a helpful little book!
Within its pages when I look
I know that I am sure to find
Conclusions thoughtful, wise and kind.

When others go to lands afar
They tell how fair those countries are!
They never see in wretched bands
Humanity with outstretched hands.

They tell of temples, carvings rare,
But not of children cold and bare!
They tell of lakes and mountains grand
But not of men who idle stand!

So greetings to that loving heart
That in each sorrow bears a part;
And health and happiness to one
Who cannot rest till work is done.

H. K. T.

Correspondence

Tagore on Russia

Editor of UNITY:

Permit me to thank you for the articles now running in UNITY by Tagore on Russia. As a teacher, I find so much in them to interest me. I feel so keenly the way he does about the futility of much of our effort in the schools because of the system into which the pupils go afterwards. But maybe our pioneer work among them in the process of awakening them to a new social order will bear fruit in time to come.

FRANK S. HARWOOD.

Keyport, New Jersey.

Commending Mr. Tigner

Editor of UNITY:

As a recent subscriber I found myself intensely interested in the two articles by Hugh S. Tigner on Buchmanism. For a long time my reaction to the movement has been similar to this writer's views, but he put the matter into United States language beyond my powers to express. If UNITY succeeds in getting a criticism of Tigner's position, a criticism worthy of publication, this subscriber will read such a contribution eagerly.

Putting the whole thing into a nutshell, I see no value in Buchmanism of a permanent nature to help along this troubled old world. In a conventional way the movement may help individuals as individuals to live a moral life, but with no new understanding of just what the world needs—in a word, too much "Buchmanism" and too little equipment to meet the world's real needs.

GEORGE L. MASON.

Orange, Massachusetts.

Lucia Ames Mead the First to Propose Geneva as the World Capital

Editor of UNITY:

It is often forgotten, and by many was never known, that Mrs. Mead was the first to propose Geneva as the world capital. That was in 1907, in a letter to the Boston Transcript; 1907 was the year of the Second Hague Conference. We were at The Hague in the summer of that year, attending one of the general sessions of the Conference, and remained at The Hague for some time. The city was the center of much anxiety and speculation as to the international future. It was already substantially settled that The Hague would remain the permanent international judicial center; but interests other than judicial were rapidly multiplying, and it was evident that a general international capital would be a necessity in no distant future. The Hague people believed that The Hague itself should be the capital; and one pretentious real estate scheme was based upon that great expectation.

We did not believe that The Hague was the right place for the world capital, and frankly said so. Manifestly it could be in none of the rival great countries. It must be in a small country without great military power. It seemed to us that Geneva, quite aside from its natural attractions, was the right place for the capital. Later in the year we were at Geneva and studied the matter carefully. We even studied the city's environs to consider proper places for the extensive grounds and public buildings which its position as the world capital would demand. When we returned to Boston in the autumn, Mrs. Mead discussed the whole matter with great thoroughness in her letter in the Transcript; and I wish that that letter could be republished at this time.

At the conclusion of the World War, in 1919, the League of Nations as the true means to international organization was urged by the President of the United States, and was adopted; and Geneva was agreed upon as the world capital.

When we were in Geneva in 1927, the League of Nations was an accomplished fact and in hopeful operation. We called upon Sir Eric Drummond, the Secretary of the League, and were warmly received. We were surprised at his saying to Mrs. Mead in the course of our conversation, that he was especially glad to meet us because they knew at Geneva that she had been the first to urge that Geneva be the world capital. We learned afterwards that this fact had been communicated to him by Professor Manley O. Hudson of the Harvard Law School, who was spending most of his summers at Geneva studying the foundation work of the League of Nations, and who has recently been elected one of the judges of the World Court at The Hague.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

Brookline, Mass.

As to Bombing

Editor of UNITY:

In 1933 it was proposed at Geneva to outlaw bombing from the air. The proposal was defeated by the opposition of the British representatives. The British government of India was in the habit of bombing Indians on the Northwest frontier, and wanted to keep on. It was a convenient weapon to use against those who could not strike back. Now men and women in London are practising the use of gas masks, and the government, for fear of air raids, has postponed indefinitely the erection of a big building which was to have housed under one roof the departments of army, navy, and aviation. Sometimes evil deeds, like chickens, come home to roost.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Cambridge, Mass.

The Spanish Crisis

Editor of UNITY:

In view of the interest in the "Spanish Crisis," we have sent you this week under separate cover, a booklet by John Haynes Holmes which is distributed by the War Registers League.

We shall be glad to send copies of this booklet to any of your readers who will send five cents in stamps or coin to cover mailing costs.

WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE.

171 W. 12th St., New York, N. Y.

The Field

(*Continued from page 66*)

"For All Religions, Castes and Creeds"

In view of the religious diversity in India, which is often considered a bar to political unity, the opening ceremony of the Bharata Mata Temple by Mahatma Gandhi is significant. More than 25,000 people were present, made up of Hindus, Moslems, Sikhs, Parsees, Jains, Buddhists, Chinese, and Harijans from all parts of the country.

"This temple," Gandhi declared, "contains no image of any god or goddess. It has only a relief map of India made of marble in it. I hope this temple, which will serve as a cosmopolitan platform for the people of all religions, castes and creeds, will go a great way in promoting religious unity, peace, and love in the country."

The various religions represented by their rituals and by the expressions of their leaders were extraordinary. Hymns from the Vedas were followed by recitations from the Koran and ceremonies by Buddhist monks and Parsees. Every leader stressed the fact that the principal teachings of all religions were the same and wished the temple to Mother India to be a place where the followers of all religions could offer their prayers. The Moslem, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan, declared that in ancient Islam a mosque was a place of worship for all people, irrespective of their religion.—*Nofrontier News Service.*

Ten Commandments for Industry

Industry, with all its advantages of wealth, leadership, social standing, education, and influence, ought to assume a larger responsibility and be the first to take the initiative in the promotion of justice, cooperation, and peace. Ten commandments follow:

1. Thou shalt not exploit women and children.

2. Thou shalt not deny the laborer's right to more than a mere "living wage."

3. Thou shalt not make a machine out of him.

4. Thou shalt not impair his health and steal his prospects in life by forcing upon him long hours and unhealthful working conditions.

5. Thou shalt not spy upon him, or bear false witness against him.

6. Thou shalt not suddenly throw him out of work through the "shutdown" or "lockout," and then wash thy hands of all responsibility for him. Neither shalt thou be unmindful of the helplessness of his old age.

7. Thou shalt not decide critical issues in industry solely from the angle of money-making.

8. Thou shalt not employ high-priced legal talent to find a way to "beat the law" whilst thou holdest up thy hands in holy horror over the "sit-down strike."

9. Thou shalt cease looking at labor from the master-slave point of view, and begin to regard industry as a stewardship for the common good.

10. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself.

—*Zion's Herald.*

CHRISTENDOM

A Quarterly Review

$3 A Year — Charles Clayton Morrison, *Editor* — John Knox, *Managing Editor* — $1 A Copy

Christendom is inspired by the belief that we are at the opening of a new creative era in world culture; that the middle walls of partition that separate the departments of our culture from one another, and religion from all of them, must be broken down. It operates, therefore, along a wide cultural front.

SPECIAL OFFER

The SPRING NUMBER is just off the press. Send $3 for Subscription starting with this new issue, and we will send you a *free copy* of the previous number containing article of your choice from list at right.

BOOK REVIEWS

Each issue equals a book in quality and contents. In addition to many articles, every number contains 60 or more pages of reviews of all worth while contemporary books.

REPRESENTATIVE ARTICLES

Economic Freedom....*Vergil C. Aldrich*
Pacifists Way Out...*Sir Norman Angell*
Christian Optimism .....*Nicholas A. Berdyaev*
Religion and Romanticism.....*Christopher Dawson*
Ideals and Sex Problems.....*Hornell Hart*
Revival of Cruelty.....*John T. McNeill*
Aversion of Men of Taste to Evangelical Religion..*Nathaniel Micklem*
End of Peace Movement..*Dr. Morrison*
Reverence for Life...*Albert Schweitzer*
Church Union.....*Herbert L. Willett*
Missionary Dimensions .....*Hugh Vernon White*
Christianizing International Politics.....*Sir Alfred Zimmern*

Willett, Clark & Co., Publishers,
440 So. Dearborn St., Chicago.
Enter my subscription to *Christendom.* I enclose $3. Send me the Spring Number and *free copy* of the number containing article:.....
Name .....
Address .....

John Haynes Holmes, Editor — Curtis W. Reese, Managing Editor

UNITY

Introducing UNITY to new readers, we offer a trial subscription of . . .

6 Months for $1.00

A Journal of Free and Critical Opinion

UNITY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago

Please enter my subscription for a trial period of six months, for which I enclose $1.00.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....

Published semi-monthly.
Regular subscription $3.00.